



Armory Park Historic Zone Advisory Board
Tuesday, October 15, 2019
Parish Hall, St. Andrew's Church
545 S. 5th Avenue
E. 16th Street and S. 5th Avenue
Tucson, Arizona

Legal Action Report/Meeting Minutes

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 pm. A quorum was established with ten APHZAB members present: Ms. S. Bachman-Williams, Mr. T. Beal, Mr. J. Burr, Mr. M. Crum, Ms. P. Factor, Mr. G. Furnier, Mr. S. Grede, Ms. M. McClements, Mr. P. O'Brien, and Ms. G. Schau.
IT Support: Mr. K. Taylor

2. Approval of Minutes

Action Taken: A motion was made by Ms. Factor to approve the meeting minutes as presented, seconded by Mr. Burr. Ten votes in favor.

3. Call to the Audience

None.

4. Reviews

Reviews were heard out of order.

a. HPZ 19-72, 419 S 5th Ave Demolish existing rear detached non-contributing building. Full Review/ Contributing Resource

Board member Mr. Grede recused himself from the review (as adjacent property owner) and took a seat in the audience.

The item was continued from the 8-20-19 meeting which requested further review by the HPO to determine remaining historic fabric of the building and its eligibility status, how the separation of it and its roof to the building to the north be best achieved, and a basic understanding of future development site uses relating to the building.

Alex Lee, owner, started the presentation by describing the disrepair (with squatter activity) of the building. His intention is to remove the accessory structure if it not contributing, to allow for a parking area on site for the envisioned remodel of the principal building into 4 (or 5) apartments.

Gabriel Vargas of GGV Designs went over the information he was aware of from records. The building is probably from about 1945, but little remains of the original building (15' x 33'). There are two portions; an east room adjoining the adobe building to the north and a narrower (14' deep) portion set back from the property line by about a foot, with a different roof line. He then outlined his presented package which showed interior photos of the walls. They reviewed the structure on site with Ms. Jodie Brown, City of Tucson, and got permission to do exploratory demo in order to get more information about the historic nature of the building. Mr. Vargas stated that on the North portion of the structure there is a furred-out area attached to the adobe wall. The existing adobe has a stucco finish. The remaining room walls are modern 2x framing with OSB sheathing and siding/stucco. The west room has some older 2x6 sheathing and floor joists but is entirely encased in T111 siding. Ms. Brown clarified that little historic fabric remains and the building is indeed considered non-contributing at present.

Mr. Vargas stated that the future development of the property is likely dependent on the available on-site parking. He presented a basic plan that showed 6 on-site parking spaces, a rolling gate and wall set back from the rear property line, with the main building to be subdivided as 4 apartments. He further noted that no demolition would take place until approved rehabilitations to the building were begun.

The Board recognized that although there had been some question whether the building was potentially eligible, it was now apparent little if any historic fabric remains. Because it has been determined to be non-contributing, its demolition could be approved, but ideally only if a rehabilitation/redevelopment project is approved.

The Board again noted its concerns about how the removal would affect the adjoining property and how the restoration of its south wall and roof overhang area would be addressed. The Board stated that hand tools should be used when working with the existing adobe structure in order to preserve the integrity and adequate drainage would need to be maintained adjacent to the adobe building. Mr. Lee stated that if any damage is incurred to Mr. Grede's property, he would pay to have the adjacent structure repaired.

The Board commented that retention of the eastern wall adjacent to Herbert Avenue was preferred to retain the streetscape and could possibly be achieved, while allowing the general proposed site plan parking area. It was noted that the 10' proposed setback for a new fence was not necessary. Mr. Lee also agreed to look into reconstructing the massing along Herbert to maintain the streetscape.

The Board commented that the access to the principal building (onto a raised porch) is not accurately shown on the site plan and may influence the placement of the parking area. The Board also noted that the structure itself will require some restoration. Ms. Brown clarified that the board should only comment on the demolition proposal.

Mr. Vargas asked if a development package is required for Board approval, since the City of Tucson has apparently required the Board's demolition approval first.

The Board stated that a recommendation for the demolition could be contingent on the approved development package.

Action Taken: Motion made to conditionally recommend approval of the demolition, subject to: 1) approval of a future redevelopment package for the entire property which may or may not include revised setbacks, prior to demolition; 2) that hand tools be used for the demolition to protect the adjoining historic structure, which will require monitoring for proper restoration of its exposed south wall/roofline; 3) all costs for the required repairs/ restoration after the demolition shall be borne by the property owner (not the adjoining property owner); and 4) there should be no encroachment within 3 ft of the exposed adobe structure for drainage.

Motion made by Mr. Burr, seconded by Mr. Crum. Eight votes in favor: Ms. Bachman-Williams, Mr. Beal, Mr. Burr, Mr. Crum, Ms. Factor, Mr. Furnier, Ms. McClements, and Ms. Schau. One abstention, Mr. O'Brien. One recusal, Mr. Grede.

b. HPZ 19-42, 79 E 13th St
Repair/replace approximately 77 windows on the 1st and 2nd floor.
Full Review/ Contributing Resource

Ms. Brown clarified that the projects for the two sides of the building could be discussed concurrently but would require separate motions.

The project was continued from the 6-18–19 meeting, which focused primarily on the proposed window replacements. Further guidance on other issues were addressed then (see LAR). Mr. Lee provided an update on his current intentions. Rather than replacing the 77 windows, he was now prepared to repair all the windows and replace the previously installed vinyl windows (7 in total, not approved) with replications fashioned to match in wood. He presented a full-scale poplar window mockup as well as an original broken window for comparison. Mr. Lee noted that they are re-stringing/weighting the windows as required for full use. The board requested square corners around the panes be retained. He also noted that he was fabricating new wood screens all around to match an original screen found on site. He noted he would not use plastic opaque screening material.

The Board thanked Mr. Lee for agreeing to restore all the windows and retain as much of the historic fabric as possible.

Action Taken: Motion made to recommend approval of the project as presented: the repair of all existing wood windows and replacement of all vinyl windows with new wood (double hung) replacements to match the existing historic windows on all exterior facades, and add new replacement wood framed screens.

Motion made by Mr. Burr, seconded by Ms. Factor.
Ten votes in favor: Ms. Bachman-Williams, Mr. Beal, Mr. Burr, Mr. Crum, Ms. Factor, Mr. Furnier, Mr. Grede, Ms. McClements, Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Schau.

c. HPZ 19-88, 71 E 13th St

Repair existing windows and add screens. Upgrade the electrical service and add new AC units.

Full Review/ Contributing Resource

The same general project outlines are proposed for this side of the building: repair of all existing wood windows, as necessary, and adding new wood screens to match existing. Reference discussion above. Mr. Vargas stated that the new AC condensing units will be placed on the roof, concealed from view, or between buildings. The electric boxes will be upgraded to meet code.

Action Taken: Motion made to recommend approval of the project as presented including the repair of all existing exterior windows and adding wood replacement screens.

Motion made by Mr. Burr, seconded by Mr. Beal. Ten votes in favor: Ms. Bachman-Williams, Mr. Beal, Mr. Burr, Mr. Crum, Ms. Factor, Mr. Furnier, Mr. Grede, Ms. McClements, Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Schau.

d. HPZ 19-89, 742 S 3rd Ave

Replace asphalt shingle roof with metal roof, install solar panels, and install water harvesting units.

Full Review/Contributing Resource

The Board stated that this project began as a minor review for solar panel installation. During that review, the City representative and Review board members noticed that the roof had been replaced with a new metal standing seam, without review. Water harvesting equipment had been installed at some time in the past, without a permit, and that gutters were to be added to the new roof.

The Board noted that the unreviewed work has already been done and asked Ms. Brown for guidance. Ms. Brown stated that this review should be completed as though the work was proposed, not completed, and if the information presented is insufficient, the board should request more information.

Stacy Lane, the owner applicant, presented. She commented that due to the abnormal route to this review, she had no visual printed documentation to review. Ms. Lane showed images of the existing work: new roof and catchment system containers, on her phone but provided no plans or elevations. She commented that she had understood that her contractor had obtained the necessary permits, but none were recorded. Ms. Lane noted that she had prior permitted projects on the site, including a guest house with a corrugated metal roof. She also noted that she was unaware that a permit was required for the water harvesting system when it was installed 8 years ago. She had chosen the "silver" color for the standing seam roof because that was what she had seen in her area. She now wants to paint the fascia/ drip edges green to match the trim on the existing building. She did provide an example of the proposed green painted metal gutter she had planned to install.

Ms. Lane did say that the proposed solar system was flush mount, flat panels, done by the same company which had just been installed and approved for another house nearby recently.

The Board noted that the “proposed” roof is standing seam, which is the preferred type of metal roof to be used in the district (not corrugated, which is only approved for accessory buildings, generally) but suggested that the low rise roof of the bungalow style building is not the best candidate for the type of roofing. A more compatible style could have been metal shingles. However, the roof seems to have been installed properly without changing the structural details of the rafters and form. The green painted edges are preferred and the gutter type and style is the preferred type for the district. Although unfortunate, the roof is existing.

The board noted that the permitting requirement for water harvesting tanks/systems had been introduced at roughly the time of installation, and that the siting was correct in that it was well placed back on a side elevation and did not alter/ hide the principal facades/ windows.

The Board noted that the proposed solar panels appear to be flush mounted and flat, close to the roof surface and not generally visible from the street face. They have been presented as consistent with recommended types, placement, and minimally visible.

The Board did note that the front ramp had been a temporary installation for the prior owner, and asked if was to remain. Ms. Lane intends to retain it at present as it is useful for strollers, etc. currently in use.

The Board asked if there is any required action to be taken against the contractor. Ms. Brown stated that generally in similar situations, that contractors are charged double fees by the City of Tucson for the required permits (which will need to be issued), as a deterrent.

Action Taken: Motion made to recommend approval of the (existing) standing seam metal roof, new green paint and gutters, (existing) water harvesting units (as sited), and proposed flush mounted, low rise, flat solar panels, as presented. (The approved roof shall not be a precedent for bungalow type roofs in the future.)

Motion made by Mr. Burr, seconded by Mr. Beal. Mr. Grede asked to amend the motion to state that this will not set a precedent for bungalow type roofs in the future. Mr. Burr and Mr. Beal accepted the amendment.

Ten votes in favor (of the amended motion): Ms. Bachman-Williams, Mr. Beal, Mr. Burr, Mr. Crum, Ms. Factor, Mr. Furnier, Mr. Grede, Ms. McClements, Mr. O'Brien and Ms. Schau.

e. HPZ 19-78, 524 S. Herbert Ave.

Rehabilitation of an existing building: new stucco, roof repairs and shingle replacement, fencing and gates: repair and restore windows and doors; new rear addition.

Courtesy Review/ Contributing Resource

Dennis Gonzales followed up the first courtesy review (see 10-1-19 LAR) from his continued full review from 9-17-19 (see LAR). He presented new elevations of the project showing that the roof style has changed from parapet to gabled roof. He reiterated that the new proposed addition is inset from the original structure by four feet on both sides and has a reduced footprint. He has squared off the south entry wall, but otherwise the plan presented then is largely the same. He has revised the new windows on the addition to be single hung (double hung looking) instead of the horizontal sliders that were last seen. He stated the new windows would be a Jeld-wen wood, single hung for egress concerns. He noted that although not shown on the elevations, that he intended to retain the transoms over the doors and the historic fascia plate. He also suggested repairing the stucco on the original walls, rather than replacing it and wood match the finish on the new addition.

Mr. Gonzales commented on the demo plan for the property, stating that one of the original adobe walls would be removed and the roof load would be picked up with a post and beam system to avoid adding load to the existing adobe. He also noted an original opening in the back adobe wall would be infilled.

Mr. Gonzales again noted that this proposal is 200 sf smaller than the original floor plan. The exterior is to remain, the fascia would remain, and all the windows would be wood.

The Board noted that the new windows look out of balance with the existing windows. The applicant noted that the elevation is incorrectly drawn, the proposed windows would be taller than wide. The Board asked what size the existing windows are, Mr. Gonzales stated they are roughly 3' x 5' but not a standard size. The Board stated that the new windows should be in the same or similar proportion but that an exact duplication of the historic windows would be inappropriate. The Board also noted that the original windows would be 2 over 2 and that the vertical mullion should be continued in both panes. It also noted that the door elevations for replacement doors are inappropriate and should be of a type consistent with the age and style of the building. The board also suggested that since the wall has been set back 4 ft from the neighbor, smaller windows could be added in the bathrooms, if desired.

The Board thanked Mr. Gonzales for reworking the roof type and form, noting it was a more compatible addition. The Board did further clarify that the stucco finish on the addition should be compatible but not replicate the restored stucco/finish on the historic building to differentiate the old from the new. Finally the board suggested the partial demolition/ replacement of the west adobe wall should be clarified on the demolition plan, including notation of replacement materials.

The Board then suggested that the final review should include the site context in relation to adjacent structures, identify utility placements and include revised details for the door/ window/ transom repairs/replacements.

Action Taken: None

5. Design Guidelines Project

a. Update on the design guidelines

Ms. Brown stated that comments from PRS have not yet come in. No action is required by the board until those comments are sent. The item is not expected on the 10-24-19 PRS agenda but should be on the November agenda.

6. Minor Review Update

a. Updates on recent Minor Reviews provided

None.

7. Call to the Board

Mr. Burr noted that the (earlier) IID-DRC meeting on 10-15 looked at the planned 13 story building that will replace Maloney's Tavern on N. 4th Ave. It will have its formal review in early November. The 5-story building proposed for 140 E. Broadway, next to the Julian Drew building, was approved today.

8. Call to the Audience

Ms. Brown asked if the board is interested in general city updates for design projects currently being reviewed. The Board stated they would like to hear them, especially if related to nearby projects. She stated that a neighborhood project (127 S. 5th Ave.) had been reviewed by PRS recently and had a two to two vote with no action taken. It will soon go on to the IID-DRC.

Ms. Brown stated that the Welcome Diner PAD had some vague language that would need to be clarified prior to a Mayor and Council vote.

9. Future Agenda Items-Information Only

Ms. McClements noted that a mini meeting (for elections only) would happen at the November 12 neighborhood (APNA) Meeting to replace Ms. Factor and Mr. Crum who have reached the end of their terms. Ms. McClements asked the board to reach out to any potential applicants for appointment to APHZAB to attend that meeting. Mr. Burr noted that Helen Erickson would be leaving the PRS board next year and may be a viable option to join APHZAB in January.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:51pm.